

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

Meeting Minutes

June 22, 2006

1. Call to Order.

Chair Alfano called the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. A quorum was achieved.

-
Members Attending:

Michael Barnes, Cathy Baylock, Maureen Brooks (Vice Chair), Robert Cronin, Karyl Matsumoto, Matt Grocott, Mike Harding, Marc Hershman, Ken Ibarra, Julie Lancelle, Naomi Patridge, and Mark Meadows.

Staff/Guests Attending:

Richard Napier, Sandy Wong, Walter Martone, Tom Madalena, Al Meckler, Corinne Goodrich, and Vivian Ma.

2. Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda.

Check tapes

3. Minutes of April 27, 2006 meeting.

*Motion: Member Hershman moved/Matsumoto seconded approval of the April 27, 2006 minutes.
Motion carried.*

4. Countywide Bike Map Update.

Adam Lodge from San Mateo County Public Works gave a presentation on the update of the countywide bike map. He described the process that he has been working on with Member Brooks to update the foldable bike map. Unlike the old map, the entire County will be included and it will be double sided.

For now we will not be building a web-based version of our map. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is building a Bay Area wide bicycle route map that will be available on the web. San Mateo County will wait to see how the MTC maps turn out before spending more resources and time on building a local San Mateo County web based mapping application.

It was also requested to have laminated maps although the cost of laminated maps will likely be prohibitive. For the new map it was advised that we should make our maps free of charge. There is also the possibility of selling advertising on the maps in order to reduce the cost. At the next stage of development the subcommittee will look at the map and make comments.

Adam Lodge recommended that we focus on a web-based application so that the user could pull and print a portion of the map that they desire.

Motion: Member Hershman moved/Matsumoto seconded approval of the April 27, 2006 minutes.
Motion carried.

5. Presentation on the Grand Boulevard (El Camino Real)

Corrine Goodrich from SamTrans gave a presentation on the Grand Boulevard Initiative. It is envisioned that new housing, great transit (Bus Rapid Transit) could revitalize the downtowns of the cities to make the downtowns be destinations. A Grand Blvd. Task Force was formed through SamTrans and Joint Venture Silicon Valley. The presentation gave a sense of the characteristics of other boulevards and the constraints and opportunities that are present along El Camino Real.

Currently El Camino is difficult to cross and difficult to for pedestrian travel. Safety is a concern for both pedestrians and bicyclists along El Camino Real. Aesthetics could be improved such that places along El Camino Real will be places where people want to go.

Partners to date include all cities from San Jose to Daly City, C/CAG, SamTrans, ABAG, MTC, Caltrans, representative from the business and environmental communities, SAMCEDA and State and Federal representatives.

Some members of the committee expressed concern that there may not be room for bicycle lanes along El Camino Real and that alternate routes should be developed since El Camino Real is a constrained right of way. **Mark (?)** stated that El Camino Real is almost impossible for bike travel. The preferred way to go would be to look at alternatives for travel parallel to El Camino Real. Member Brooks noted that the Countywide Plan does not include El Camino Real as a preferred bike route in San Mateo County. Perhaps the route could follow the Caltrain track right of way instead of El Camino Real for a north south thoroughfare. Member Matsumoto stated that another concern is the lack of contiguity of the lanes when some cities can't provide bicycle lanes due to the current lane configuration of El Camino Real. One of the main concerns has to do with parking and the fact that generally cars will be parked parallel and there is a safety concern with car doors being opened into the bike lane. **Other members** recommended that it should be a continuous route and the lack of contiguity along El Camino Real is a problem.

6. Critique of the Regional Bike/Pedestrian Program (RBPP) project ranking process and the scoring criteria and develop changes to be used in future cycles.

Sandy Wong, C/CAG staff, gave a presentation on the process for the selection of projects for the last round of the Regional Bike/Pedestrian Program funds. For the next cycle of the program we should have about 1.3 million of TDA funds (since last year was skipped) available and staff will come back to the BPAC at the next meeting around August or September. Chair Alfano mentioned that he was pleased with the pre-scoring and that he felt that it was necessary to go out and complete the site visits as part of the process. Additionally, if projects are over a certain dollar amount it would be a good idea to tell the applicants that they should identify if the project could be partially funded to complete phases of projects so that the committee would not have to make arbitrary decisions on dividing up projects.

Motion: Member Hershman moved/Matsumoto seconded approval of the April 27, 2006 minutes.

Motion carried.

7. Review and approval of the process to update the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle Route Plan.

Tom Madalena, C/CAG staff gave a presentation on the proposed process and timeline for the update of the San Mateo County Comprehensive bicycle Route Plan. The process is to have the plan update completed by C/CAG staff over the next 1½ years and to have the plan update process placed on a once every five years schedule.

A major component of the update is to revise the list of recommended projects. Currently the plan has 15 mid to short-term recommended projects. The goal is to solicit desired and needed projects from the local jurisdictions throughout San Mateo County. Projects submitted will then be taken to the BPAC for review and approval for inclusion in the updated plan.

*Motion: Member Hershman moved/Matsumoto seconded approval of the April 27, 2006 minutes.
Motion carried.*

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.